X-RAY CLUSTERS IN A CDM+Λ UNIVERSE:

A DIRECT, LARGE-SCALE, HIGH RESOLUTION, HYDRODYNAMIC SIMULATION

Renyue Cen and Jeremiah P. Ostriker

Princeton University Observatory

Princeton, NJ 08544 USA

1

ABSTRACT

A new, three-dimensional, shock capturing, hydrodynamic code is utilized to determine the distribution of hot gas in a CDM+Λ model universe. Periodic boundary conditions are assumed: a box with size $85h^{-1}$Mpc, having cell size $0.31h^{-1}$Mpc, is followed in a simulation with $270^3 = 10^{7.3}$ cells. We adopt $\Omega = 0.45$, $\lambda = 0.55$, $h \equiv H/100$km/s/Mpc$= 0.6$, and then, from COBE and light element nucleosynthesis, $\sigma_8 = 0.77$, $\Omega_b = 0.043$. We identify the X-ray emitting clusters in the simulation box, compute the luminosity function at several wavelength bands, the temperature function and estimated sizes, as well as the evolution of these quantities with redshift. This open model succeeds in matching local observations of clusters in contrast to the standard $\Omega = 1$, CDM model, which fails. It predicts an order of magnitude decline in the number density of bright ($h\nu = 2 - 10$keV) clusters from $z = 0$ to $z = 2$ in contrast to a slight increase in the number density for standard $\Omega = 1$, CDM model.

This COBE-normalized CDM+Λ model produces approximately the same number of X-ray clusters having $L_x > 10^{43}$erg/s as observed. The background radiation field at 1keV due to clusters is approximately 10% of the observed background which, after correction for numerical effects, again indicates that the model is consistent with observations.

The number density of bright clusters increases to $z \sim 0.2 - 0.5$ and declines, but the luminosity per typical cluster decreases monotonically with redshift, with the result that the number density of bright clusters shows a broad peak near $z = 0.5$, and then a rapid decline as $z \to 3$. The most interesting point which we find is that the temperatures of clusters in this model freeze out at later times ($z \leq 0.3$), while previously we found in the CDM model that there was

a steep increase during the same interval of redshift. Equivalently, we find that L^* of the Schechter fits of cluster luminosity functions peaks near $z = 0.3$ in this model, while in the CDM model it is a monotonically decreasing function of redshift. Both trends should be detectable even with a relatively "soft" X-ray instrument such as ROSAT, providing a powerful discriminant between $\Omega = 1$ and $\Omega < 1$ models. Detailed computations of the luminosity functions in the range $L_x = 10^{40} - 10^{44}$erg/s in various energy bands are presented for both cluster cores ($r \leq 0.5h^{-1}$Mpc) and total luminosities ($r < 1h^{-1}$Mpc). These are to be used for comparison with ROSAT and other observational data sets. They show the above noted negative evolution for the open model.

We find little dependence of core radius on cluster luminosity and the dependence of temperature on luminosity $\log kT_x = A + B \log L_x$, which is slightly steeper ($B = 0.32 \pm 0.01$) than indicated by observations ($B = 0.265 \pm 0.035$), but within observational errors. In contrast, the standard $\Omega = 1$ model predicted temperatures which were significantly too high. The mean luminosity-weighted temperature is 1.8keV, dramatically lower (by a factor of 3.5) than that found in the $\Omega = 1$ model, and the evolution far slower (-30% vs -50%) than in the $\Omega = 1$ model to redshift $z = 0.5$. A modest average temperature gradient is found with temperatures dropping to 90% of central values at $0.4h^{-1}$Mpc and to 60% of central values at $0.9h^{-1}$Mpc.

Examining the ratio of gas-to-total mass in the clusters, we find a slight antibias ($b = 0.9$ or $(\frac{\Omega_{gas}}{\Omega_{tot}})_{cl} = 0.083 \pm 0.007$), which is consistent with observations $[(\frac{\Omega_{gas}}{\Omega_{tot}})_{obs} = 0.097 \pm 0.019$ for the Coma cluster for the given value of h, $cf.$, White 1991].

Cosmology: large-scale structure of Universe – hydrodynamics – Radiation Mech-

anisms: Bremsstrahlung – X-ray: general

1. INTRODUCTION

In the preceding two papers of this series (Kang *et al.* 1994 = KCOR hereafter; Bryan *et al.* 1994), we have examined the properties of X-ray clusters in the standard COBE-normalized CDM universe and reached two primary conclusions: 1) the standard CDM model overproduces bright X-ray clusters ($L_x > 10^{43}$erg/s) by a factor in excess of five; 2) observations of the ratio of gas-to-total mass in great clusters of galaxies, combined with our simulations, impliy that we live in an open ($\Omega = 0.2$ to 0.3) universe (with or without a cosmological constant). There are other well-known difficulties with the standard CDM scenario (*cf.* Ostriker 1993 for a review), and there are advantages to open CDM models (*cf.* Efstathiou 1992) which arise from other considerations, independent of cluster X-ray properties. Motivated by this knowledge, we turn in this paper to examine an open CDM model with a cosmological constant. We wish to investigate the difference in the evolutionary behavior as well as the $z = 0$ properties of X-ray clusters in these two different models. There is every expectation that cluster X-ray properties should provide a strong discriminant among cosmic theories. We will, throughout this paper, make comparisons with KCOR wherever it is possible, since that calculation was made with identical physical assumptions and with identical numerical modeling techniques adopted.

In §2 we outline the method and initial conditions, in §3 the results, and in §4 we assemble our conclusions.

2. METHOD AND INITIAL CONDITIONS

2.1 Method

The superiority of the new TVD code over conventional hydrodynamic codes

(e.g., Cen 1992) and various tests of the code have been presented in Ryu *et al.* (1993); essentially the shock capturing technique improves resolution by approximately a factor of $2-3$ for a given grid (i.e., nominal resolution).

The simulation reported on in this paper did not include any atomic processes, i.e., no cooling or heating was added, except for the adiabatic cooling due to the general expansion of the universe, and "heating" occurs only due to adiabatic compression or to entropy generation at shock fronts. For the hot gas, which we will discuss in this paper, this approximation is valid, since the cooling time exceeds the Hubble time by a fair margin. One can, after the fact, compute the emissivity with allowance for line emission. Doing this would increase the computed luminosity significantly at and below 1keV but would have little effect in the $2-10$keV band. We will return to this important matter in a subsequent paper devoted to a comparison with observations. Here we wish, primarily, to contrast open, $\Omega < 1$, and standard $\Omega = 1$, variants of the CDM scenario.

2.2 Initial Conditions

We adopt a CDM+Λ model with the following parameters: $n = 1$, $h = 0.6$, $\Omega = 0.45$, $\Omega_b = 0.043$, $\lambda = 0.55$, and $\sigma_8 = 0.77$. Note that the amplitude normalization of the power spectrum is determined by COBE observations (Efstathiou, Bond, & White 1993; Kofman, Gnedin, & Bahcall 1993) parameterized by σ_8 to translate into conventional notation. This chosen value of σ_8 corresponds to a "bias" of $b \equiv 1/\sigma_8 = 1.30$, close to what is physically expected on this scale (*cf.* Cen & Ostriker 1992,1993) lending further credibility to the adopted model. Our box size is $85h^{-1}$Mpc with $N = 270^3$ cells and 135^3 dark matter particles, so our nominal resolution is $0.31h^{-1}$Mpc with our real spatial resolution slightly

worse than this. The box size is determined by a compromise between two considerations. A larger box would allow longer waves and give us more of the rare, high temperature, high luminosity clusters. A smaller box (with a fixed N) would allow us to resolve the cluster structure better. The choice of Ω_b is consistent with light element nucleosynthesis (Walker *et al.* 1991). The power spectrum transfer function is computed using the method described in Cen, Gnedin, & Ostriker (1993). Gaussian initial conditions are used and the same set of random numbers adopted as in KCOR.

3. RESULTS

The X-ray clusters in the simulation are identified as follows. We first calculate the total X-ray luminosity due to thermal Bremsstrahlung (assuming primeval composition and neglecting lines) for each cell, given the cell density and temperature, assuming that hydrogen and helium are fully ionized (which is always true in the regions like great clusters of galaxies). The detailed formulae were presented in KCOR. Note that in the following discussion all units of length are given in co-moving, not metric, coordinates.

First we tag all cells having total X-ray luminosity higher than 10^{38}erg s^{-1}. This emissivity corresponds to 3.2×10^{39}erg/s/h^{-3}Mpc^3, which is 3.2 times the mean box emissivity at z=0, and is 9.1 times the mean at z=3. The number of X-ray bright cells defined in this way is 47,826, which comprises a fraction 2.4×10^{-3} of the box volume. These are selected as X-ray bright cells. Then we find the local maxima (by comparing L_{ff} of each X-ray bright cell with that of 26 neighboring cells) and identify them as the centers of the X-ray clusters. Having defined the centers of the X-ray clusters, we go back to the whole simulation box

7

to define our X-ray clusters. We analyze the simulation in the following two different ways (which correspond to spheres of radius $0.5h^{-1}Mpc$ and $1.0h^{-1}$Mpc). First, each cluster core consists of 27 cells (26 cells surrounding the central cell plus the central cell). These 27 cells are weighted so that the total volume of the cluster equals the volume of a sphere of radius $0.5h^{-1}Mpc$ as appropriate for observationally defined X-ray clusters (see KCOR for details). A similar algorithm is used for the $1.0h^{-1}$Mpc volumes.

Our $(85h^{-1}\text{Mpc})^3$ box at $z = 0$ contained (0,0) clusters with (total, core) luminosity brighter than 10^{45}erg/s, (1,0) brighter than 10^{44}erg/s, (10,5) brighter than 10^{43}erg/s, (66,40) brighter than 10^{42}erg/s and (257,174) brighter than 10^{41}erg/s. We explain the absence of clusters brighter than 10^{45}erg/s as simply due to the size of our box. An additional factor of at least two in scale (and 8 in computer resources) would be required to significantly improve on the quoted results. An immediate comparison to the KCOR results is possible if one notes that for $L_x > 10^{44}$erg/s, the KCOR paper found (8,1) clusters with (total, core) luminosity, higher than the specified limit compared to (1,0) in this work. The difference is significant at this level of luminosity and we will see below (Figure 1b and 4b) that, while the standard CDM model overproduces bright X-ray clusters, this open model provides an adequate fit to observations. The fraction of the box in brightest cells which provide (50%,90%) of the total box emissivity is $(3.8 \times 10^{-5}, 8.8 \times 10^{-4})$

It is convenient to fit the luminosity function to the three parameter Schechter function

$$n(L)dL = n_0(L/L^*)^{-\alpha}e^{-L/L^*}d(L/L^*) \quad .$$ (1)

8

Luminosity functions for cluster cores were computed in four frequency bands: total (bolometric) luminosity, $0.3 - 3.5\text{keV}$, $0.5 - 4.5\text{keV}$, and $2 - 10\text{keV}$, and are displayed in Figures 1a, 2a, 3a and 4a, respectively. The results for entire clusters (emission from a $1h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ sphere) are presented for the same frequency bands in Figures 1b, 2b, 3b and 4b. The figures show the domain of cluster properties in which the observations and our computations overlap most: $10^{40}\text{erg/s} \leq L_x \leq 10^{44}\text{erg/s}$ and $0 \leq z \leq 1$. Also shown (cross-shaded areas) in Figures (1b) and (4b) are the observations from Henry & Arnaud (1991) and from Henry (1992), respectively. The comparison shown in (4b) is the more reliable one, since line processes (omitted in our computation) are unimportant in the 2-10keV band.

We see that the computed number densities of bright clusters ($h^2 L \geq 10^{43}\text{erg/s}$) are in accord with the observed ones while in KCOR we found that those of the CDM model are above the observed mean by a factor of about 5. We have computed approximate Schechter function fits to the results, with the numerical parameters (n_0, L^*, α) as a function of redshift collected in Table (1), and the simulated data extended to $z = 5$. Also in Table (1) we integrate over the cluster luminosity function, using the Schechter fit, $j_{cl} \equiv n_0 L^* \Gamma(2 - \alpha)$, showing the results in the second-to-last column. We give also, in the last column, the total emissivity from the box as j_{gas}, which includes the emission from lower density regions further from cluster cores than $1.0h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ and also from clusters whose central emissivity is less than our cutoff value. Note that L_x^* and L are in units of 10^{44}erg/s; n_0, $n(L > 10^{43})$ and $n(L > 10^{44})$ are in units of $10^{-6}h^3\text{Mpc}^{-3}$; j_{cl} and j_{gas} are in units of $10^{40}\text{erg/s/h}^{-3}\text{Mpc}^3$, and j_{cl} may be larger than j_{gas} due to the inaccuracy of the Schechter fit.

We estimate that α is well constrained (± 0.03) and that the product $n_0 L^*$ is

also fairly well constrained, but individual values (n_0, L^*) are poorly determined because L^* is dependent on the quite uncertain highest luminosity clusters. To estimate the purely statistical uncertainty, we reanalyzed the $z = 0$ data from the lower panel of Table 1a (total, integrated X-ray cluster properties) looking separately at two halves of the box. The fractional differences $(|\Delta Q/Q|)$ for $Q \equiv (\alpha, L_x^*, kT_x, n_0, j_{cl}, j_{gas})$ were found to be $(0.0062, 0.90, 0.62, 0.74, 1.31, 0.76)$ respectively. The fact that even the integral j varies significantly between the two halves of the box reminds us again of the "cosmic variance". Our sample volume is not large enough to give us a robust estimate for the cosmic mean value of j. Note that the variances of all the quantities (except for α) in this model are larger than those in the CDM model (KCOR), presumably due to the fact that this CDM+Λ model has relatively more large-scale power than the CDM model, indicating that a larger box is clearly desirable. This, of course, is related to the virtues of open models: they typically have relatively more large-scale power and thus match better a variety of large-scale structure observational constraints (*cf.* , e.g., Efstathiou *et al.* 1993) than do $\Omega = 1$ models.

We see that the cluster cores, as we have defined them, contain between 1/3 and 1/2 of the total X-ray emission in the regions studied, comparable to the results of KCOR. The total cluster luminosity in the box is typically 3/4 of the X-ray emission from the box, the same level was found in the CDM model (KCOR). This fraction depends on energy, as one can see by comparing Tables 1b and 4d. Since most of the very high temperature gas is in the central regions of clusters, the fraction of the total emission from identifiable clusters in the $2 - 10\mathrm{keV}$ region approaches unity. For the total luminosity the Schechter α parameter is approximately 1.55 (as compared to 1.50 in KCOR) with little evolution, and

10

α, for the few keV bands is typically slightly flatter at 1.4. For $\alpha < 2$, as we have noted, most of the luminosity arises from bright clusters. Observationally $\alpha = 1.9 - 2.0$; so this model provides a marginally better fit than does the standard $\Omega = 1$, CDM model. Allowance for line emission processes would increase the luminosity of the lower luminosity (low temperature) clusters more than the high luminosity (high temperature) clusters, still further improving the fit. Without a careful treatment of line emission, it would be premature to say if the fit to the slope of the luminosity function, as represented by α in this model, is adequate.

The number density of bright clusters peaks at intermediate redshift, and the typical luminosity is (for small redshift) relatively constant, so there is a peak emissivity at approximately $z = 0.2 - 0.5$ for the several keV bands. Thus, crudely speaking, in this model one expects weak "positive" evolution until nearly $z = 0.5$ and then negative evolution thereafter. The peak occurs at significantly lower redshift in the open model than in the standard CDM model. Figure (5a) shows the comparison between the two models for the number density (per unit comoving volume) of clusters with rest frame luminosity $> 10^{43}$erg/s. Figure (5b) shows the number density (per unit comoving volume) of clusters with rest frame luminosity (integrated over the entire frequency range) $> 10^{43}$erg/s for five different models. We see that it is the overall normalization on the relevant scale (σ_8) rather than Ω which is the dominant factor on the evolutionary behavior of the bright cluster number density. Physically, the rapid evolution occurs at an epoch when most of the bright clusters are collapsing. After that, the evolution still goes on due to processes such as merging, but it is relatively mild. Comparing the COBE-normalized standard CDM and COBE-normalized CDM+Λ models,

11

negative evolution begins earlier and is stronger for the open model. Allowance for cosmological effects would make both models evolve more negatively, but these effects would be exaggerated in the CDM+Λ case due to the rapid increase in luminosity distance (with redshift) in cosmologies with a significant cosmological constant. The different evolutionary path of the cluster luminosity function is the most significant difference we have found between open and $\Omega = 1$ models. For example, Figure (5b) shows more than an order of magnitude decline in the number density of clusters with 0.5-4.5keV luminosity $> 10^{43}$erg/s between redshift zero and two for the open model, but it shows a slight increase for the standard CDM $\Omega = 1$ model.

We believe that the peak in emission seen at moderate redshift is real. The reasons for this are discussed in KCOR. The approximate Press-Schechter formalism, which does not allow for a variety of effects, cannot easily mimic the full non-equilibrium hydrodynamic treatment.

While the integrated X-ray emissivity evolves fairly slowly over the period surveyed in Table (1a) with a flat maximum between $z = 0.2$ and $z = 0.3$, L^* and n_0 tend to evolve more rapidly and in opposite directions. The primary difference which we find between this model and the CDM model (KCOR) is the evolution of the bright end X-ray clusters. In the $\Omega = 1$ CDM model (KCOR) we find that L^* is a monotonic decreasing function of redshift, while in this model we find L^* peaks at $z \sim 0.3$. The reason for this difference is the dramatically different behaviors of the universal expansion at later times in the two models. We expect that in a lower Ω model, L^* will clearly peak at an even higher redshift. The evolution of L^* should be observable and provide a powerful discrimenant among cosmic models.

To highlight the negative evolution of the bright end of the luminosity function, we listed in the fifth and sixth columns of Tables 1b-1d (sixth and seventh columns of Table 1a) the comoving density of clusters having luminosity greater than 10^{43}erg/s and 10^{44}erg/s. For reasons stated earlier (based on our limited box size), we use the Schechter fit rather than direct counts to compute these columns. Comparing columns 4 and 6 (5 and 7 of Table 1a), we see that, although the total number density n_0 of clusters increases with redshift (until $z \approx 1 - 2$), the number density of the highest luminosity ($L_x > 10^{44}$erg/s) clusters decreases for $z > 0.5$. This is presumably one of the effects leading to the observational appearance of "negative evolution". Statistical fluctuations in our results are still quite significant due to the limited box size, especially for $n(L_x > 10^{44}$erg/s$)$.

Redshift effects strongly exaggerate this tendency to observe negative evolution, since higher redshift clusters tended to have lower temperatures (*cf.* column 4 of Table 1a and Figures 6, 13), and both effects will reduce the energy observed by satellites measuring the X-ray flux in high energy bands. Note that the negative evolution in the density of clusters with $L > 10^{44}$erg/s is more and more steep in Tables (a→ d) as one looks at higher energy bands, although statistical fluctuations are large.

The emission-weighted temperature, T_x, of each cluster is calculated and the distributions are shown in Figure (6). The arrow in each panel indicates the average cluster temperature (weighted by luminosity) at the given epoch. Also shown in Figure (6b) is the observed temperature function from Henry & Arnaud (1991) as the cross-shaded area. Note that the computed temperature function is somewhat lower than the observed one, but we think that the limited size of our simulation box caused an omission from the computation of the highest tem-

perature clusters; a bigger box is needed before we can have definite conclusions on this. We see that at all epochs the coolest clusters dominate the statistics (the turnover at low T_x is presumably caused by our definition of minimun cell luminosity to constitute an X-ray bright cell), but the mean is determined by the high mass, high luminosity, high temperature end of the distribution. The mean temperatures, indicated by arrows, are included in column 3 of Table (1a). We will return to the issue of temperature evolution later. Looking ahead to Figure (8a), we see the strong correlation found between T_x and total luminosity (clusters are shown at $z = 0$).

Now let us turn again to the total cluster luminosity (vs. core luminosity) as shown in the lower panels of the tables and in Figures 1b-4b, the quantity normally measured by satellite observations. The ratio of $(j_{cl,tot}/j_{cl,core})$ is near 2.0 ± 0.1 for the redshift range $0 < z < 1$; a similar value was found in KCOR.

We can also roughly estimate the effective radii of the clusters by assuming that the emission has a profile

$$j = \frac{j_0}{[1 + (r/r_x)^2]^2} \tag{2}$$

and determining, from the ratio of the luminosity (integrated over frequency) of the central cell to the total cluster luminosity, the value of r_x which would produce this ratio. We show in Figure (7) the radii determined in this fashion. The peaks seen in the panels of Figure (7) are, of course, artificially induced by our cell size of $0.31h^{-1}$Mpc, but the distribution to larger radii should be reasonably accurate. Arrows indicate the luminosity-weighted average values. Since brighter clusters tend to be resolved, these numbers should be reliable, but the arrows are uncomfortably close to the peaks of the curves, indicating that

14

the most luminous clusters may be somewhat unresolved. We see a weak trend of increasing size with increasing time, which is in the theoretically anticipated direction. Longer wavelengths became nonlinear later, producing larger clusters, and smaller clusters merge to produce larger clusters with increasing time.

Now in Figures (8a,b) we show the scatter plots of (T_X, r_x) vs. L_x (integrated over frequency). We see that there is a clear correlation between L_x and T_x. But we do not see any strong correlation between L_x and r_x. The best fit lines (dashed) indicate a slope of $(0.36 \pm 0.01, 0.32 \pm 0.01)$ for (core, total) cluster region. In KCOR we found $(0.394 \pm 0.001, 0.375 \pm 0.001)$ for the CDM model. The observed correlation [*cf.* Figure (8a) shown as cross-shaded area] between $\bar{T}_x$ and total cluster luminosity is $\log_{10} \bar{T}_x(\text{keV}) = \log_{10}(4.2^{+1.0}_{-0.8}) + (0.265 \pm 0.035) \log_{10}(h^2 L_{44})$, according to Henry & Arnaud (1991). In the region where a comparison can be made, the agreement with observations is good.

Next, we address temperature variations within clusters. Given our limited resolution, there is little that can be accurately determined on this issue from our simulations, but we are able to compare the central cell (Volume= $3.1 \times 10^{-2} h^{-1}\text{Mpc}^3$) with the surrounding cells $(3^3 - 1^3)$ (volume of size $5.9 \times 10^{-1} h^{-3}\text{Mpc}^3$) and the cells surrounding these cells $(5^3 - 3^3, \text{vol}= 3.0 h^{-3}\text{Mpc}^3)$. We define the ratio of the inner cell to the next cube as T_c/T_{shell} (volume-weighted average) and show the scatter diagram in Figure (9). No trend is seen with luminosity, and the median value, indicated by the dashed line, is 1.4. The cluster gas deviates significantly from isothermality, with a $5\% - 10\%$ temperature decline typically found by a radius of $0.4 - 0.5 h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ but a sharp fall-off is indicated for radii $1 h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$. In Figure (10) we compare the (luminosity-weighted) temperatures found in the three regions noted above, normalized to the tem-

15

perature in the central cell. The large dispersion is indicated by the error bar. Figures (9) and (10) show no significant differences from the analogous figures in the $\Omega = 1$ case (KCOR).

We show in Fig. 11 and 12 the evolution of cluster core radius (in metric, not comoving, units) and temperature (both luminosity-weighted) as open circles. Solid dots are from the KCOR $\Omega = 1$ computation. Also shown are the fits analytically predicted by Kaiser (1986) $R_x \propto (1+z)^{-2}$ and $T_x \propto (1+z)^{-1}$ for $\Omega = 1$, CDM model (solid line) from KCOR and this CDM+Λ model (dotted line) (note that Kaiser's prediction is valid for $\Omega = 1$ models only, but is shown also for the CDM+Λ model for comparison purposes). Examination of these figures indicates the radius changes in a way qualitatively similar to that found for standard CDM with an $\sim 40\%$ decline in radius from redshift zero to a look-back of redshift $z = 0.5$. But there is an overall difference in that the radii are smaller in the CDM+Λ model. The difference, while small (-23%), is significant, especially since the lower bound produced by our finite numerical resolution is less than a factor of two below the mean value. Since real, observed clusters are smaller than the computed clusters, this change is also in the desired direction. The differences between the two models are dramatic with regard to temperature. First, as noted, the mean temperature is a factor of 3.5 lower in the open model and the evolution is far slower (-33% to $z = 0.5$ rather than -48% for $\Omega = 1$).

Thus we see that the differences between the two models at low redshift are significant and very important, due to freeze-out at low redshift in open models. This temperature evolution should be detectable even with a relatively "soft" X-ray instrument such as ROSAT. It will be able to discriminate between $\Omega = 1$ models and $\Omega < 1$ models. Furthermore, detailed and direct numerical

16

simulations combined with more observations might provide a way to constrain Ω, or λ, or combinations of Ω and λ.

Figures (13) and (14) show the evolution in the background radiation field in two additional ways. The first shows what a comoving observer would have measured at various redshifts. But below 1keV the results are unreliable because of both the omission of line emission and the omission of IGM absorption. The second, Figure (14), shows the fractional contribution to the background seen by an observer at $z = 0$ in several bands that were produced at various epochs (in integral form). The important point to note is that most of the X-ray background (especially in the harder bands) that we see locally were produced at relatively recent ($z \leq 0.5$) epochs. This is a consequence of many things, prominant among them are the redshift factors that dilute the observable effects of emission at high redshift. But there is a major difference between the two models. In this open model, one-half of the $2 - 10$keV brightness of the sky comes from redshift less than $z = 0.3$, whereas, in the $\Omega = 1$ case (KCOR), the median point is much closer, at redshift $z = 0.2$.

Finally, let us take a slightly different route to address the issue of bias of gas relative to the mass: does the gas in dense regions, like clusters of galaxies, fairly represent the underlying mass, or is it "biased" or anti-biased? This is a question with great cosmological significance. If we know the ratio of gas (+ galaxies) to total matter in the clusters by direct observations, and we know, from light element nucleosynthesis the global baryon density, then we can divide the second number by the first to obtain the global matter density and to compare with the cherished critical density. This old line of argument has been carefully re-examined recently by White (1992) and also reanalyzed by Babul & Katz

(1993) and others.

The argument depends on knowing whether or not ρ_b/ρ_{tot} varies significantly from place to place and, in particular, whether this quantity will be found near its average value in the high density regions, where it can most easily be measured.

Our possibly counter-intuitive results are shown in Figure (15), where we plot the ratio (ρ_{IGM}/ρ_{tot}) vs. $(\rho_{tot}/\langle \rho_{tot} \rangle)$ smoothed by a gaussian of radius $1h^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}$. At any value for the total density, there is a wide range of possible values of ρ_{IGM}, but the high density regions actually have a *lower* than average ratio of baryons to total mass. We see that, in the high density clusters, where $\rho_{tot}/ < \rho_{tot} >$ approaches 10^3, the gas is under represented by a factor of 1.1. (In KCOR we found a factor of 1.7 for the CDM model.) Combining this factor with its global mean, we obtain that $(\frac{\rho_{gas}}{\rho_{tot}})_{cl} = 0.083 \pm 0.007$, which is consistent with observations $[(\frac{\rho_{gas}}{\rho_{tot}})_{obs} = 0.097 \pm 0.019$ for the Coma cluster for the given value of h, *cf.* White 1991].

We can use the comparison with KCOR to address the question of whether or not the small anti-bias found is real or due merely to numerical errors spreading out the gas density more than it does the dark matter density. In this simulation the core radii of the clusters are smaller on average than in the $\Omega = 1$ case, putting them in better agreement with observations but, as noted, closer to our grid spacing. Thus numerical diffusion in this case should be a larger (relative) effect here than in KCOR, and the anti-bias, if it were due to numerical diffusion, would be larger. But it is smaller, indicating that this is not the case. Our best guess is that the cause of the anti-bias is related to outward propagating shocks in the transient formation phase. Since such time-dependent effects will be less in open models, the anti-bias should be less here – as it is.

Now, we treat the same problem in a somewhat different way concentrating on the identified clusters. For each simulated X-ray cluster, we compute the gas mass and total mass within a sphere of radius $1h^{-1}$Mpc (centered at the X-ray cluster center) and in Figure (16) we show the ratio (open circles) of the two masses within this sphere as a function of density of the sphere relative to the mean. The dotted line is the best log-log straight line fit for the open circles, and the solid line is the fit weighted by the luminosity of each cluster. Also shown, as the dashed line, is the global mean of the ratio. Presenting the same information in an alternative way, we show in Figure (17) the histogram of the ratio, both number-weighted (thin solid histogram) and luminosity-weighted (thin dotted histogram) in the CDM+Λ model. The heavy solid histogram (arbitrarily normalized to have a similar peak height) indicating the observational situation is adapted from Jones & Forman (1992). We see that there is a trend that poor clusters are relatively gas poor, which is consistent with observations (*cf.*, e.g., Jones & Forman 1992). The luminosity-weighted fit is closer to (but still below) the global mean with an anti-bias in the range $0.85 - 0.92$. We see that the median of the computed ratio is in agreement with the median of the observed ratio, whereas in the CDM $\Omega = 1$ model the computed ratio is lower by a factor of 2-3. Improving the observations will probably narrow the heavy histogram, and increasing the dynamical range of our simulation box will widen the thin histograms. Both expected improvements should make the agreement better.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In Figures (1-5) we show the evolution of the cluster luminosity function expected in the CDM+Λ model. In the range of parameters where there is greatest

overlap between observed and computed quantities ($0 \leq z \leq 1$, 10^{40}erg/s$\leq L_x \leq$ 10^{44}erg/s), little evolution is seen (for comoving observers) in any of the computed bands aside from a decline in the number of brightest sources (somewhat uncertain due to our limited box size) and a modest increase (by about a factor of two) in the luminosity function for fainter objects. A similar behavior was also found in the CDM model (KCOR). But the likely explanation for this is different from that in the CDM case. While in the standard CDM model, it is largely coincidental and due to the balancing of two effects: new breaking waves increase the luminosity density but mergers decrease it. In this CDM+Λ model it is primarily due to the late time freeze-out of formed clusters. The effect is seen most clearly in Figure (5), where we look only at the evolution of the brightest clusters, and see an earlier decline (with increasing redshift) of the open model than the $\Omega = 1$ models. There is an order of magnitude decline in the number density of clusters having $L_x > 10^{43}$erg/s (in the harder energy bands) in the redshift interval $z = 0 \rightarrow 2$ for this model but an increase in the standard $\Omega = 1$ CDM model. The strong negative evolution found in this paper in an open model would of course be greatly enhanced for observers (using fixed bands and intensity limits) by cosmological effects which are especially strong in models with a cosmological constant (Carroll, Press, & Turner 1992)

Figures 6 and 7 show rates of change in other quantities, the temperatures and clusters radii. These important trends are summarized in Figures 11 and 12 where we see a factor of 2-3 decline in both these quantities by redshift 1. But more interesting is the nearly constant mean temperature (luminosity-weighted) in the redshift range $z = 0 \rightarrow 0.3$ in the CDM+Λ while in the CDM model we see a sharp decrease in the temperature from $z = 0.0$ to $z = 0.3$. Equivalently

put, L^* of Schechter fits to the computed luminosity functions peaks near $z = 0.3$ in the CDM+Λ model but it increases monotonically until $z = 0$ in the CDM model. Both trends should be detectable even with a relatively "soft" X-ray instrument such as ROSAT. They might provide powerful tests for $\Omega = 1$ models and $\Omega < 1$ models. Also the actual values of the cluster temperature are much lower in the open model and in better agreement with observations.

This CDM+Λ model provides an adequate fit to the observed bright X-ray cluster luminosity function and X-ray background; however, we found that there would be too many bright X-ray clusters produced and too much integrated background X-ray intensity in the COBE-normalized standard CDM model.

We find a slight anti-bias ($\sim 10\%$) of gas relative to the mass in dense regions like the clusters of galaxies, but the model is self-consistent in the sense that the computed $(\frac{\rho_{gas}}{\rho_{tot}})_{cl} (= 0.083 \pm 0.007)$ is consistent with observations $[(\frac{\rho_{gas}}{\rho_{tot}})_{obs} = 0.097 \pm 0.019$ for the Coma cluster for the given value of h, $cf.$ White 1991], whereas there was a gross inconsistency in the $\Omega = 1$ case.

In sum, the model is significantly different from that obtained from the standard $\Omega = 1$, CDM simulation, and, with regard to all measurable quantities that we have compared to observations $[N(L_x), \langle R_x \rangle, \langle T_x \rangle, dlnT_x/dlnL_x, \rho_{gas}/\rho_{tot}]$, it is not only a better fit to observations than standard $\Omega = 1$, CDM model, but also is an adequate representation of them. The predicted evolutionary differences between open and $\Omega = 1$ models are sufficiently great to allow definitive tests by current or planned X-ray satellite observations.

REFERENCES

Bryan, G.L., Cen, R.Y., Norman, M.L., Ostriker, J.P., & Stone, J.M. 1994, ApJ, in press

Carroll, S.M., Press, W.H., & Turner, E.L. 1992, ARAA, 30, 499

Cen, R.Y., 1992, ApJS, 78, 341

Cen, R.Y., & Ostriker, J.P, 1992, ApJ(Letters), 399, L113

Cen, R.Y., & Ostriker, J.P, 1993, ApJ, 417, 415

Cen, R.Y., Gnedin, N.Y., & Ostriker, J.P, 1993, ApJ, 417, 387

Efstathiou, G. 1992, NAS Colloqium on Physical Cosmology

Henry, J.P. 1992, in "Clusters and Superclusters of Galaxies", ed. A.C. Fabian (Kluwer Academic Publisher. Printed in the Netherland), p311

Henry, J.P., & Arnaud, K.A. 1991, ApJ, 372, 410

Jones, C., & Forman, W. 1992 in "Clusters and Superclusters of Galaxies" (Kluwer Publishers: Dordrecht), ed. A.C. Fabian, p49

Kaiser, N. 1986, MNRAS, 222, 323

Kang, H., Cen, R.Y., Ostriker, J.P., & Ryu, D. 1994, ApJ, in press (KCOR)

Kofman, L.A, Gnedin, N.Y., & Bahcall, N.A. 1993, ApJ, 413 1

Ostriker, J.P. 1993, ARAA, 31, 689

Ryu, D., Ostriker, J.P., Kang, H., & Cen, R.Y. 1993, ApJ, 414, 1

Walker, T.P., Steigman, G., Schramm, D.N., Olive, K.A., and Kang, H.S., 1990, ApJ, 376, 51

White, S.D.M 1992 in "Clusters and Superclusters of Galaxies" (Kluwer Publishers: Dordrecht), ed. A.C. Fabian, p17

Wu, X., Hamilton, T., Helfand, D.J., & Wang, Q. 1991, ApJ, 379, 564

FIGURE CAPTION

Fig. 1– Figure (1a): the X-ray cluster bremsstrahlung luminosity (from central $< 0.5h^{-1}Mpc$ regions) function integrated over the whole frequency range at five different red-shifts $z = (0, 0.2, 0.5, 0.7, 1.0)$. Figure (1b): the X-ray cluster bremsstrahlung luminosity (from $< 1.0h^{-1}$Mpc region) function integrated over the whole frequency range (filled dots) at the same five different redshifts. The cross-shaded area shows the observations (Henry & Arnaud 1991, $\{3.1^{+4.5}_{-1.8} \times 10^{-6} h^3 \text{Mpc}^{-3} h^2 [L_{44}(\text{bol})]^{-1}\} \times [h^2 L_{44}(\text{bol})]^{-1.85\pm0.4}$).

Fig. 2– Same as Figure (1) but for the luminosities integrated over $0.3 - 3.5$keV frequency bin.

Fig. 3– Same as Figure (1) but for the luminosities integrated over $0.5 - 4.5$keV frequency bin.

Fig. 4– Same as Figure (1) but for the luminosities integrated over $2 - 10$keV frequency bin. The cross-shaded area in (4b) indicates observations (Henry 1992).

Fig. 5– Figure (5a) shows the comparison between the two models for the number density (per unit comoving volume) of clusters with rest frame luminosity $> 10^{43}$erg/s for three X-ray bands. Figure (5b) shows the number density (per unit comoving volume) of clusters with rest frame luminosity (integrated over the entire frequency range) $> 10^{43}$erg/s for five different models.

Fig. 6– The X-ray cluster temperature (T_x, emission-weighted temperature) function at six different redshifts $z = (0, 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 5)$. Arrows indicate the luminosity-weighted average temperature $\bar{T}_x$ at each epoch. In the first ($z = 0$) panel in (5b) the cross-shaded area is the observed temperature function from Henry & Arnaud (1991) $[(1.8^{+0.8}_{-0.5} \times 10^{-3} h^3 \text{Mpc}^{-3} keV^{-1})(kT)^{-4.7\pm0.5}]$.

Fig. 7– The X-ray cluster effective radius (r_x) distribution [cf. equation (2)]. Arrows indicate the luminosity-weighted effective radius at each epoch.

Fig. 8– Figure (8a) shows the scatter plot of T_x vs L_x at $z = 0$. The cross-shaded area line indicates the observations of Henry & Arnaud (1991). The dashed line is the best fit of the simulation results. Figure (8b) shows the scatter plot of r_x vs L_x at $z = 0$.

Fig. 9– The ratio of the central cell temperature to the temperature of its surrounding shell ($\sim$ one cell thick) as a function of L_{tot}.

Fig. 10– We compare the (luminosity-weighted) temperatures found in the three regions (central cell, the shell surrounding the central and the next outer shell) and normalized to the temperature in the central cell. Departure from isothermality increase significantly for $hr > 0.5$Mpc. Note the errorbars are 1σ variance.

Fig. 11– The average cluster core radii in physical units as a function of redshift for clusters with luminosity in the $0.5 - 4.5$keV band greater than 10^{43}erg/s for CDM+Λ model (open circles, this paper) and the standard $\Omega = 1$, CDM model (solid dots, KCOR). The best fit evolutions of the form $T_x \propto (1+z)^{-2}$ are shown as a solid curve for the CDM model and a dotted curve for the CDM+Λ model.

Fig. 12– The average cluster temperature as a function of redshift for clusters with luminosity in the $0.5 - 4.5$keV band greater than 10^{43}erg/s for CDM+Λ model (open circles, this paper) and the standard $\Omega = 1$, CDM model (solid dots, KCOR). The best fit evolutions of the form $T_x \propto (1+z)^{-1}$ are shown as a solid curve for the CDM model and a dotted curve for the CDM+Λ model. Temperatures in the CDM+Λ model are lower and evolution less than in the standard $\Omega = 1$, CDM model, and tend to freeze out at lower redshift while we see a dramatic

26

increase in the CDM model approaching $z = 0$.

Fig. 13– The mean radiation intensity at six epochs, $z = 5$ (solid line), $z = 3$ (dotted line), $z = 2$ (short, dashed line), $z = 1$ (long, dashed line) $z = 0.5$ (dotted-short-dashed line) and $z = 0$ (dotted-long-dashed line). The box in the middle shows the obseravtional data by Wu *et al.* (1991). Neither line absorption nor emission has been allowed for in this figure.

Fig. 14– The distribution functions of four presently observed X-ray bands as a function of redshift (in integral form).

Fig. 15– The ratio ρ_{IGM}/ρ_{tot} as a function of $\rho_{tot}/ < \rho_{tot} >$. Results are smoothed by a gaussian window of radius $1h^{-1}$Mpc. The global mean value of ρ_{IGM}/ρ_{tot} is shown by the dashed line. Note that in the highest density regions the gas is under-represented, "anti-biased", by a factor of about 1.1 (which is less than 1.7, found for $\Omega = 1$ CDM model in KCOR).

Fig. 16– The ratio ρ_{gas}/ρ_{tot} as a function of $\rho_{tot}/ < \rho_{tot} >$ within a radius of $1h^{-1}$Mpc for each identified cluster (open circles). The dotted line is the best log-log straight line fit for the open circles and the solid line the fit weighted by the luminosity of each cluster. Also shown as the dashed line is the global mean of the ratio. We see that there is a trend that poor clusters are relatively gas poor.

Fig. 17– The histogram of the ratio both number-weighted (thin solid histogram) and luminosity-weighted (thin dotted histogram) in the CDM+Λ model. The heavy solid histogram indicating the observational situation is adapted from Jones & Forman (1992). We see that there is a trend that poor clusters are relatively gas poor, which is consistent with observations (*cf.* , e.g., Jones & Forman 1992). The luminosity-weighted fit is closer to (but still below) the global mean, with an

anti-bias in the range $0.85 - 0.92$. We see that the median of the computed ratio is in agreement with the median of the observed ratio, whereas in the CDM $\Omega = 1$ model the computed ratio is lower by a factor of 2-3. Improving the observations will probably narrow the heavy histogram, and increasing the dynamical range of our simulation box will widen the thin histograms. Both expected improvements should make the agreement better.

Table 1a. Parameters of Schechter fits for the X-ray cluster luminosity function integrated over the entire frequency range.

X-ray Cluster Core Luminosity ($< 0.5h^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}$)

α	L_x^* (10^{44})	$k\bar{T}_x$ (keV)	n_0	$n(L > 10^{43})$	$n(L > 10^{44})$	j_{cl}
1.52	0.54	1.79	4.52	3.9	7.4×10^{-2}	0.045
1.60	1.16	1.51	2.39	4.7	0.24	0.061
1.55	0.27	1.05	10.7	4.2	1.1×10^{-2}	0.053
1.54	0.15	0.84	19.1	3.1	4.8×10^{-4}	0.055
1.53	0.11	0.64	27.7	2.6	4.1×10^{-5}	0.057
1.58	0.043	0.31	37.9	0.28	8.8×10^{-12}	0.034
1.93	0.22	0.14	1.14	0.38	2.1×10^{-4}	0.035
1.90	0.11	0.054	0.37	3.1×10^{-2}	2.3×10^{-7}	0.0039

X-ray Cluster Total Luminosity ($< 1h^{-1}\mathrm{Mpc}$)

α	L_x^* (10^{44})	$k\bar{T}_x$ (keV)	n_0	$n(L > 10^{43})$	$n(L > 10^{44})$	j_{cl}
1.56	1.74	1.55	2.56	6.6	0.54	0.090
1.56	1.86	1.29	3.14	8.5	0.73	0.12
1.54	0.59	0.91	9.64	9.2	0.20	0.11
1.50	0.29	0.72	20.4	8.6	3.2×10^{-2}	0.10
1.48	0.15	0.58	36.3	6.0	1.0×10^{-3}	0.093
1.59	0.082	0.30	30.4	1.5	1.1×10^{-6}	0.054
1.78	0.046	0.15	15.1	0.11	9.4×10^{-12}	0.029
1.90	0.020	0.020	3.56	3.7×10^{-4}	9.8×10^{-24}	0.0068

Here L_x^* and L are in units of $10^{44}\mathrm{erg/s}$; n_0, $n(L > 10^{43})$ and $n(L > 10^{44})$ are in units of $10^{-6}h^3\mathrm{Mpc}^{-3}$; j_{cl} and j_{gas} are in units of $10^{40}\mathrm{erg/s/h}^{-3}\mathrm{Mpc}^3$, and j_{cl} may be larger than j_{gas} due to the inaccuracy of the Schechter fit.

Table 1b. Parameters of Schechter fits for the X-ray cluster luminosity function
in $0.3 - 3.5$keV band

X-ray Cluster Core Luminosity ($< 0.5h^{-1}$Mpc)

z	α	L_x^*	n_0	$n(L > 10^{43})$	$n(L > 10^{44})$	j_{cl}	j_{gas}
	1.45	0.22	5.86	1.7	2.4×10^{-3}	0.021	0.060
.2	1.48	0.25	6.05	2.1	4.7×10^{-3}	0.026	0.070
.5	1.45	0.26	9.32	2.4	9.3×10^{-3}	0.039	0.075
.7	1.46	0.24	9.66	3.2	6.3×10^{-3}	0.038	0.069
1	1.35	0.22	8.40	2.4	4.0×10^{-3}	0.026	0.059
2	1.38	0.14	5.25	0.78	1.0×10^{-4}	0.011	0.020
3	1.60	0.13	3.02	0.38	1.9×10^{-5}	0.0087	0.0034
5	1.90	0.010	0.03	6.4×10^{-9}	4.4×10^{-26}	2.8×10^{-5}	2.6×10

X-ray Cluster Total Luminosity ($< 1h^{-1}$Mpc)

z	α	L_x^*	n_0	$n(L > 10^{43})$	$n(L > 10^{44})$	j_{cl}	j_{gas}
	1.42	0.44	6.37	4.1	6.0×10^{-2}	0.043	0.060
.2	1.43	0.48	6.94	4.9	8.5×10^{-2}	0.052	0.070
.5	1.37	0.32	14.2	6.3	4.2×10^{-2}	0.065	0.075
.7	1.31	0.13	30.5	4.1	3.7×10^{-4}	0.052	0.069
1	1.36	0.16	22.4	4.2	1.3×10^{-3}	0.050	0.059
2	1.24	0.13	9.59	1.3	1.3×10^{-4}	0.015	0.020
3	1.60	0.35	0.77	2.5×10^{-3}	6.0×10^{-16}	0.0060	0.0034
5	1.90	0.01	0.050	1.1×10^{-8}	7.4×10^{-26}	4.8×10^{-5}	2.6×10

X-ray Cluster Core Luminosity ($< 0.5h^{-1}$Mpc)

z	α	L_x^*	n_0	$n(L > 10^{43})$	$n(L > 10^{44})$	j_{cl}	j_{gas}
0	1.39	0.21	6.32	1.7	2.2×10^{-3}	0.019	0.053
.2	1.44	0.26	5.74	2.1	5.8×10^{-3}	0.024	0.059
.5	1.46	0.57	4.65	4.0	9.4×10^{-2}	0.044	0.061
.7	1.39	0.16	12.1	2.2	6.7×10^{-4}	0.028	0.053
1	1.34	0.13	10.9	1.4	1.2×10^{-4}	0.019	0.042
2	1.33	0.054	9.30	0.18	7.2×10^{-10}	0.0068	0.012
3	1.58	0.025	5.2	3.5×10^{-3}	2.9×10^{-20}	2.7×10^{-4}	1.5×10
5	1.65	0.09	1.60	9.2×10^{-2}	1.7×10^{-7}	0.004	5.4×10

X-ray Cluster Total Luminosity ($< 1h^{-1}$Mpc)

z	α	L_x^*	n_0	$n(L > 10^{43})$	$n(L > 10^{44})$	j_{cl}	j_{gas}
0	1.36	0.44	6.46	4.0	6.4×10^{-2}	0.040	0.053
.2	1.42	0.58	5.23	4.4	0.11	0.047	0.059
.5	1.40	0.52	7.92	5.9	0.13	0.061	0.061
.7	1.32	0.14	20.6	3.1	4.6×10^{-4}	0.038	0.053
1	1.31	0.12	22.4	2.6	1.3×10^{-4}	0.035	0.042
2	1.38	0.051	11.7	0.18	2.4×10^{-10}	0.0086	0.012
3	1.58	0.035	5.2	1.7×10^{-2}	4.3×10^{-15}	3.8×10^{-3}	1.5×10
5	1.43	5.95	0.47	3.1×10^{-2}	8.8×10^{-8}	0.044	5.4×10

Table 1d. Parameters of Schechter fits for the X-ray cluster luminosity function
in $2 - 10$keV band

X-ray Cluster Core Luminosity ($< 0.5h^{-1}$Mpc)

z	α	L_x^*	n_0	$n(L > 10^{43})$	$n(L > 10^{44})$	j_{cl}	j_{gas}
	1.22	0.088	9.84	0.67	2.4×10^{-6}	0.011	0.026
2	1.37	0.16	5.01	0.92	2.9×10^{-4}	0.011	0.024
5	1.34	0.15	6.70	1.1	2.5×10^{-4}	0.014	0.019
7	1.35	0.17	3.13	0.63	2.9×10^{-4}	0.0074	0.013
	1.20	0.10	3.88	0.34	4.4×10^{-6}	0.0045	0.0078
2	1.17	0.081	0.79	4.7×10^{-2}	7.4×10^{-8}	7.0×10^{-4}	7.8×10
3	1.13	0.018	0.14	2.9×10^{-5}	5.1×10^{-23}	2.8×10^{-5}	3.1×10
5	1.80	0.004	0.01	1.8×10^{-16}	1.3×10^{-26}	1.8×10^{-6}	2.5×10

X-ray Cluster Total Luminosity ($< 1h^{-1}$Mpc)

z	α	L_x^*	n_0	$n(L > 10^{43})$	$n(L > 10^{44})$	j_{cl}	j_{gas}
	1.19	0.18	9.40	2.0	1.7×10^{-3}	0.020	0.026
2	1.35	0.30	5.88	2.4	1.3×10^{-2}	0.024	0.024
5	1.31	0.25	5.01	1.7	5.1×10^{-3}	0.016	0.019
7	1.32	0.20	2.82	0.71	8.1×10^{-4}	0.010	0.013
	1.13	0.17	3.14	0.63	4.4×10^{-4}	0.0058	0.0078
2	1.10	0.10	1.25	0.11	1.8×10^{-6}	1.3×10^{-3}	7.8×10
3	1.03	0.036	0.14	1.0×10^{-3}	1.7×10^{-15}	5.2×10^{-5}	3.1×10
5	1.80	0.005	0.01	3.8×10^{-14}	1.5×10^{-26}	2.3×10^{-6}	2.5×10